

1  
2  
3  
4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 PATRICIA A. McCOLM,  
9 Plaintiff(s),  
10 v.  
11 SAN FRANCISCO HOUSING AUTHORITY,  
12 ET AL.,  
Defendant(s).  
Case No. C-02-5810 PJH (JCS)  
**ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S O  
TO ALL MOTIONS FILED C  
FEBRUARY 28, 2007 [Docket**

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S OBJECTION  
TO ALL MOTIONS FILED ON  
FEBRUARY 28, 2007 [Docket No. 160]**

14 The Court has received Plaintiff's Objection to All Motions Filed on February 28, 2007  
15 Pursuant (the "Objection") [Docket No. 160]. The Objection challenges the order of February 14,  
16 2007, in which the district judge in this matter set various deadlines regarding motions to compel.  
17 The Objection seeks to strike the discovery motions filed on February 28, 2007, (the "Discovery  
18 Motions") and noticed for hearing before the undersigned magistrate judge on April 20, 2007.

19 The Objection seeks to strike all of the discovery motions on the basis that the San Francisco  
20 Housing Authority Defendants (“Defendants”) failed to comply with the Local Rules of this court.  
21 The chronology is as follows: on February 13, 2007, Defendants delivered to the Court a Motion for  
22 Administrative Relief Requesting Extension of Deadline to File Motions to Compel, along with a  
23 proposed Order. A proof of service in the Court’s file, as well as the copy of the Motion for  
24 Administrative Relief, indicates that Plaintiff was served by U.S. Mail with both of these documents  
25 on February 13, 2007.<sup>1</sup> The Motion for Administrative Relief was filed in the Clerk’s Office on the

<sup>1</sup> While Local Rule 7-11 generally requires that a copy of a motion for administrative relief be delivered to the other parties on the same day that the motion is filed, the Court notes that Plaintiff's address in this matter, both in her pleadings and on the proofs of service filed by the parties, is a post

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1 following day, February 14, 2007. After reviewing the file in the case, and the Motion for  
2 Administrative Relief, the district judge set a reasonable discovery schedule for motions to compel  
3 in an order dated February 14, 2007.<sup>2</sup> The Motion for Administrative Relief sought only an  
4 extension of time to file a motion to compel because, inter alia, Defendants only received a copy of  
5 transcripts of Plaintiff's two days of deposition on February 6, 2007, a mere three days before the  
6 original deadline for motions to compel.

7 Good cause appearing, to the extent that the Objection seeks to strike the Discovery Motions,  
8 the Objection is OVERRULED, and that Motion to Strike is DENIED. The district judge in this  
9 matter set a reasonable schedule for discovery motions, and Defendants have complied with that  
10 schedule.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12  
13 Dated: March 19, 2007

14   
15 JOSEPH C. SPERO  
16 United States Magistrate Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 office box in San Francisco.

27 <sup>2</sup> While Local Rule 7-11 provides that motions for administrative relief are deemed submitted  
28 after the time for opposition has run (three days after the motion was filed), nothing in Rule 7-11 forbids  
the Court from ruling on a motion for administrative relief without the necessity of an opposition.